



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,874	04/19/2005	Ryuji Ueno	Q87423	5640
23373	7590	07/09/2008		
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER	POLANSKY, GREGG
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		1611
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/09/2008	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

SUGHRUE@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,874	Applicant(s) UENO, RYUJI
	Examiner Gregg Polansky	Art Unit 1611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-13,16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-13,16 and 17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/07/2008

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Applicant's response, filed 4/07/2008, to the Office Action mailed 12/07/2007 is acknowledged. Applicant canceled Claims 2, 14, and 15, amended Claims 1 and 3-11, added Claims 16 and 17, and presented arguments in response to the Office Action.
2. Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed 4/07/2008, is acknowledged and has been reviewed.
3. Claims 1, 3-13, 16 and 17 are pending.
4. Applicant argues Claim 10, previously withdrawn by Examiner for not reading on the elected species, should be included in the claims under examination. Applicant's argument is persuasive.
5. Claims 1, 3-13, 16 and 17 are presently under consideration.
6. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive in part. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

8. Claims 1, 3-13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites the proviso that "Z is C=O and/or Ra is a saturated or unsaturated lower or medium aliphatic hydrocarbon residue which has a halogen substituent". The Specification does not disclose representative examples of compounds defined by the requirement of Z is C=O linked with:

- a. Ra is a saturated lower aliphatic hydrocarbon,
- b. Ra is a saturated medium aliphatic hydrocarbon,
- c. Ra is an unsaturated lower aliphatic hydrocarbon, and
- d. Ra is an unsaturated medium aliphatic hydrocarbon.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

10. Claims 1, 3-13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ueno et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,234,954).

Ueno et al. teach a method for the treatment of hyperlipidemia comprising administration of a 15-keto-prostaglandin compound, including a 13,14-dihydro-15-deto-16,16-difluoro-prostaglandin E compound. See Abstract; column 15, "FORMULATION

EXAMPLE 2"; column 20, claim 6; and column 22, claim 10. Ueno et al. teach the disclosed PGE compounds decrease blood levels of triglyceride, cholesterol or phospholipid (irrespective of cause, e.g., disease, drug or food) by promoting release into the intestine or release with feces. Further, Ueno et al. teach the method useful for reducing blood lipids in obese individuals. See column 15, lines 27-45.

Treating hyperlipidemia in obese individuals would inherently treat obesity. It is noted that *In re Best* (195 USPQ 430) and *In re Fitzgerald* (205 USPQ 594) discuss the support of rejections wherein the prior art discloses subject matter, which there is reason to believe inherently includes functions that are newly cited, or is identical to a product instantly claimed. In such a situation the burden is shifted to the applicants to "prove that subject matter to be shown in the prior art does not possess the characteristic relied on" (205 USPQ 594, second column, first full paragraph). There is no requirement that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the inherent disclosure at the time of invention, but only that the subject matter is in fact inherent in the prior art reference. *Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharm. Inc.*, 339 F.3d 1373, 1377, 67 USPQ2d 1664, 1668 (Fed. Cir. 2003); see also *Toro Co. v. Deere & Co.*, 355 F.3d 1313, 1320, 69 USPQ2d 1584, 1590 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("[T]he fact that a characteristic is a necessary feature or result of a prior-art embodiment (that is itself sufficiently described and enabled) is enough for inherent anticipation, even if that fact was unknown at the time of the prior invention"). Also see *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 403 F.3d 1331, 1343-44, 74 USPQ2d 1398, 1406-07 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (holding that a prior art patent to an anhydrous form of a compound "inherently"

anticipated the claimed hemihydrate form of the compound because practicing the process in the prior art to manufacture the anhydrous compound "inherently results in at least trace amounts of" the claimed hemihydrate even if the prior art did not discuss or recognize the hemihydrate).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1, 3-13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,234,954), as evidenced by Dietz (Pediatrics, Vol. 101, Issue 3 (Supplement), pages 518-525).

The teachings of Ueno et al. are presented *supra*.

Hyperlipidemia is common in obese individuals. See Dietz, page 518 "Abstract" and page 521, "Hyperlipidemia". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the teachings of Ueno et al. to treat a common symptom of obesity, hyperlipidemia, by the administration of a 15-keto-prostaglandin compound, including a 13,14-dihydro-15-deto-16,16-difluoro-prostaglandin E compound (*supra*). One would have been motivated to do so by the teaching of Ueno et al. (i.e., 15-keto-prostaglandin compounds are useful for reducing

blood lipids in obese individuals) with further motivation provided by Dietz (i.e., hyperlipidemia association with obesity).

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill in the art might reasonably infer from the teachings. (*In re Opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA) 1976). In light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a). From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

13. Claims 1, 3-13, 16 and 17 are rejected.
14. No claims are allowed.
15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregg Polansky whose telephone number is (571)272-9070. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9:30 A.M. - 7:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregg Polansky/
Examiner, Art Unit 1611

/Ardin Marschel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614